

IT IS MY CONTENTION that the domestication of animals and the development of agriculture were the consequence of Man's discovery of the male role in procreation.

The most ancient belief about reproduction appears to have been that the menstruating female is fertilized by the moon – her *menstruum* [moon-stream] coagulating in its light, to form new life. Which presents the origin of the so-called menarche 'taboo' – the pubescent girl sequestered from the moon's 'alluring gaze' during that traumatic first period,¹ to protect her against cosmic coagulation before the birth canal had fully formed.

In his study of Kennewick Man,² coroner James Chatters noted the *preponderance* of young female inhumations during the early Clovis period, speculating that many of them died in childbirth. In such cases, menarche might prove to have been the only time these young women ever menstruated – pregnancy and lactation delaying ovulation until the eventuation of a subsequently fatal pregnancy (*ie*, among the survivors of the initial pregnancy).

It is not inconceivable that ancient Man, wherever possible, sought to foster the *maturity* of daughters before exposing them to the carnal moonlight³ and the mortal perils of 'premature' childbirth. An interpretation which envisions an age when procreation had yet to be understood.

It was arguably the pregnancy of one of these cloistered young maidens – 'consoled' in her dark exile by a compassionate father, brother or uncle – that led to the ultimate discovery of the actual origin of conception.

¹ A Maori woman at menstruation is taboo and anyone touching her is taboo. Now, the Siamese, who imagine that evil spirits swarm in the air, believe that it is *these who enjoy the first-fruits of their girls and who cause the 'wound'* of which the menstrual blood is the result and proof. It is contact with this blood of which the Maori male is so afraid; add to this the fact that the Maoris themselves not only identify menstrual blood with an evil spirit, *Kahukahu*, but also hold that the taboo state generally is due to the influence of ancestral spirits, and identification of taboo and 'spiritual' influence is so far complete." (emphasis added) [ERNEST CRAWLEY, *The Mystic Rose: A Study of Primitive Marriage & of Primitive Thought in its Bearing on Marriage*, 1932: WATTS, London; 4th ed, p9]

² JAMES CHATTERS, *Ancient Encounters*, 1998: SIMON & SCHUSTER, New York

³ The Funan Dynasty of southern Indochina traces its origin to the Hindu prince Kaundinya and consort *Soma, the daughter of the serpent king*, Mucilinda lord of the waters [cf. CHRISTOPHER PYM, *The Ancient Civilization of Angkor*, 1968: NEW AMERICAN LIBRARY, New York, p22]

NOTE *naga* "serpent" – a *lunar divinity* – is cognate with *nagari* "city" (*cœr*); cf. *Angkor* and *Nagari*, the Indian alphabetic or serpentine script

And with this came the realization that the ‘magic’ of birth also resided in the wand, not just the womb. As construed in an earlier work:

The ‘earth-mother goddess’ not only brought forth the fruits women gathered from bole and branch and ‘game’ hunted by the men, but also afforded natural shelter for her creatures in the cavity of her provident loins (*ie*, caves). The opportunity to witness actual birth among animals before the advent of husbandry, it bears noting, was likely as remote in late Palaeolithic times, as it remains today for hunters (pregnant females, on the other hand, long familiar as prey). The arresting spear-throwers carved from antler which survive from the Magdalenian age (*ca* 15,000 BC), with the image of “a fawn or young ibex, looking back over its shoulder and in the process of excreting an oversized turd upon which birds are perching”,⁴ may in fact, depict an enigmatic insight into procreation, from the rare observance of a captive young doe (or ibex) giving birth – through the same orifice as divine woman.⁵

Because copulation does not always result in conception, men had been led to conclude that the power to create life resided wholly with women (menstrual blood, quickened at the sight of a shooting star, mystically coagulating to form new beings). But at some point toward the end of the Quaternary Ice Age (8300 BC), it seems someone began to comprehend that procreation was the result of copulation, that the magic of the womb was in fact dependent on the magic of the wand: a sudden dawning that they had maintained reverence all along, for the wrong god! Yet how could they undertake to redress this awful miscalculation at large, when their proof would take so insufferably long to demonstrate to disbelievers? The revelation likely drove the new ‘gods’ – the first fathers in history – to extremes of discretion, retreating ever further into exile until the seeds of an ‘elite’ dynamic (*ie*, ‘the elect’, ‘the patriarchy’ or ‘priest class’) took firm root in the divining band, by default.

They gradually realized that they might demonstrate their new divinity with captive animals (until then, arguably not systematically bred) – giving rise to the second great civilizing facility

⁴ JOHN PFEIFFER, *The Creative Explosion*, 1987: CORNELL, Ithaca, p199

⁵ NICK DRUMBOLIS, *God’s Wand*, 2002: LETTERS, Toronto, pp17/8

after ‘writing’: husbandry.⁶ And eventually, these endeavours produced the seed of systematic agriculture (from widespread preliminary experience with shifting cultivation, long afforded by the proliferation of flora of the increasingly temperate age), the recognition that procreation was the result of a congress of genders, *ultimately* alerting them to the critical importance of fertilized flowers⁷ to the production of seed (and the subsequent enhancement of cross-pollination to productivity, which facilitated development of the domestic breeds).⁸

Authorities studying the accumulated data remain in the dark about the origin of agriculture.⁹ As related in my earlier work:

According to one theory, systematic cultivation developed ultimately from domestication of the dog by Mesolithic hunters, initially employed to aid them in the hunt. Their ability to help round up wild herds for slaughter was adapted through enclosure, to the maintenance of these herds in captivity, which led to systematic domestication and a need for crops to sustain livestock.¹⁰ This refines the theory where essentially conservative cultures must be impelled by crisis to adapt, posed on the condition that “if agriculture provided a more restricted diet, with less nutrition, at a greater labour cost, why did anyone become a farmer?”¹¹

The relative absence of animal domestication in the Americas before the recorded advent of the Europeans (apart from the dog

6 “I am the true seed [sperm] engendered by the great wild ox, the eldest son of An” – as related by Enki the water-god (sperm being liquid) in the Sumerian poem, ‘Enki and the World Order’; the ox further symbolizing what the ‘hieratic’ horned figures in the painted caves symbolized: lunar cycle [SAMUEL NOAH KRAMER, *History Begins at Sumer*, 1959: ANCHOR, Garden City, p94]

7 The earliest phase of agriculture advancing without determined selection [cf. C. D. DARLINGTON, ‘The Silent Millennia in the Origin of Agriculture’ in *The Domestication and Exploitation of Plants and Animals* edited by P. J. Ucko & G. W. Dimbleby, 1969: DUCKWORTH, London, p68]

8 NICK DRUMBOLIS, *God’s Wand*, 2002: LETTERS, Toronto, pp21/2

9 “Yet, in spite of the importance of the process of plant domestication that ultimately led to agriculture, little is known about how, where, when, and why it happened.” [RICHARD S. MACNEISH, *The Origins of Agriculture and Settled Life*, 1992: UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, Norman, p3]

10 Lewis Morgan posits a progression from horticulture or garden cultivation to systematic domestication of animals, followed by a need for agriculture or field cultivation – facilitated by the development of the plow – to keep them fed [LEWIS HENRY MORGAN, *Ancient Society*, nd: BHARATI, Calcutta, pp19–27]

11 WAYNE M. BLEDSOE & JOHN S. THOMAS, ‘The Origins of the Agricultural Foundations of Civilization’ in *Historical Reflections* vol x no 1 (spring 1983) UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO, p86

and guinea pig, and in restricted areas of the Andes much later, the llama or alpaca and some fowl – Muscovy duck and chicken), however, might argue for an alternative thesis. The theory that systematic domestication arose from cultivation – with animals, accustomed to cultivated sites near springs or rivers, increasingly affording the opportunity as pests for capture and domestication (especially in arid regions) – is likewise attenuated by the American presentiment. Domestication of the dog, while affording hunters the opportunity to witness live animal birth and potentially accelerate their understanding of procreation, doesn't invariably lead to this insight (as shifting cultivation will not always lead to the discovery of pollination; *cf.* vegetative reproduction). The pioneers of agriculture had identified something not a few Stone Age cultures failed to recognize well into the 20th century AD.¹²

The so-called megalith missionaries,¹³ it has been conjectured, had some sort of 'power' that permitted their passage through Europe without rousing the resistance of any band they encountered en route. This arguable advantage must have been palpable on sight. They had come to inculcate others in the secrets of the wand and acquit a sacred duty to their patriarchal god to convert all men to the verity of their divine insights. They bore implements of bronze and a vast array of other civilizing innovations with which to impress and oblige their hosts, but above all, they drove flocks of goats and sheep before them – an undeniable sign to those who had yet to domesticate anything but the dog, of their indisputably divine command of nature. This earned them entry into and safe passage through the remotest territory.¹⁴

12 NICK DRUMBOLIS, *God's Wand: The Origin of the Alphabet*, 2002: LETTERS, Toronto, pp40/1

13 GEOFFREY BIBBY, *The Testimony of the Spade*, 1956: KNOPF, New York, pp234/5

14 DRUMBOLIS, *op cit*, p65

